

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1 and 9 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 9.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 7 are objected to for unclear and vague language. Claims 1 and 7 are amended by this reply for purposes of clarification of the language. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

The claims are amended for purposes of clarification. Specifically, vague and unclear language is removed from the claims. Further, independent claims 1 and 9 are amended to further define an anticipation band. No new matter is added by way of these amendments, as support can be found in the originally filed claims and in Figures 1-2 of the Specification.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,900,872 ("Ashe"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is directed toward anticipation the display of content when a scroll procedure is used by a user viewing a document. When the document is scrolled, new content must

be displayed that corresponds to a different portion of the document. In the claimed invention, an anticipation band of zones is marked (*see* reference number 10 in Figure 1 of the Specification) so that content that falls within the anticipation band is divided into pixmaps and copied for quick display upon scrolling. The anticipation band is calculated with respect to the visible part of the document. *See* Specification, Figures 1-2.

Accordingly, the amended independent claims require, in part, (i) calculating and chopping the buffer_memory into pixmaps as a function of a size of the document, of the visible part, and of the anticipation band; and (ii) an anticipation band that comprises content anticipated to be shown in the visible part of the document after the document is scrolled; and (iii) when the document is scrolled, copying the content in the pixmaps of the anticipation band into the visible window and redrawing the anticipation band. That is, while the claimed invention is directed toward displaying content upon scrolling by a user, the claimed features are focused on the actual display area and not on the scroll bar itself.

Turning to the rejection, “[a] claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). Further, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicant respectfully asserts that no such anticipation band is disclosed in Ashe.

Specifically, Ashe is focused on the contents of a scroll bar itself, and not on the display area of a document. Ashe discloses that a scroll bar has four elements: a background (44), a thumb (46), and a pair of indicator arrows (48 and 50). *See* Ashe, col. 4, ll. 29-49. Each of these elements are

associated with a display area that define the outer boundaries of the areas in the display in which the scroll bar elements can be drawn. *See Ashe*, col. 5, ll. 25-38. In other words, the rectangular areas described in *Ashe* are areas of the display devoted to the drawing of the scroll bar itself. In contrast, the claimed invention requires calculating and chopping the region of graphics memory for a document into pixmaps. The pixmaps, as claimed, are not for the scroll bar itself. Rather, the pixmaps divide the document itself into rectangular regions as shown in Figures 1 and 2 of the Specification. Thus, none of the rectangular regions disclosed in col. 5 or Figs 6A and 6B of *Ashe* can possibly be equated with pixmaps. Accordingly, *Ashe* fails to disclose (i) as required above.

Further, *Ashe* fails to disclose an anticipation band as claimed. The anticipation band is an area of pixmaps of the buffer memory that are closest in physical proximity to the visible part of the document, and comprises content anticipated to be shown in the visible part of the document after the document is scrolled. None of the thumb regions, indicator regions, or scroll bar background region disclosed in *Ashe* can be equated with an anticipation band as claimed, because the regions disclosed in *Ashe* do not comprise content anticipated to be shown after the document is scrolled. Further, none of the regions described in *Ashe* represent areas of memory closest to the visible part of the document. In fact, *Ashe* does not even focus on the displayed portion of the document, except to say that the scroll bar is displayed on the outer most portions of the document. As such, *Ashe* is completely silent with respect to an anticipation band as claimed, and thus, fails to disclose (ii) as required above.

In addition, from the above, it logically follows that *Ashe* fails to disclose the copying of content in pixmaps of the anticipation band after scrolling and re-drawing the anticipation band,

because Ashe fails to define an anticipation band relative to the visible portion of the document, as required by the claims. Accordingly, Ashe fails to disclose (iii) as required above.

In view of the above, it is clear that the Examiner's contentions fail to support an anticipation rejection of amended independent claim 1. Pending dependent claims 2-7 are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Further, dependent claim 2 recites that the anticipation band (10) comprises a minimum of a particular number of columns and rows outside of the visible part of the document in the visible window (11). Clearly, because Ashe does not break up the display area into pixmaps of rows and columns, it is not possible for Ashe to disclose a minimum number of rows/columns of any type of anticipation band. Figures 7-8 of Ashe are the only drawings that show a thumb region (46) mapped to the position of a cursor (53); however, the regions described in Ashe do not correspond to an anticipation band that is set relative to the visible window of the document being scrolled. Thus, Ashe clearly fails to teach a minimum number of columns and rows *outside* the display window that define an anticipation band, as required by claim 2. Accordingly, favorable consideration of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 8

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashe. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Ashe fails to disclose or render obvious the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Claim 8 depends directly from claim 1, and is therefore patentable over Ashe

for at least the same reasons argued above. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-16

Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashe in view of US Patent No. 6,802,061 ("Parthasarathy"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Ashe fails to disclose or render obvious the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Independent claim 9 has been amended to include similar subject matter as claim 1 (*i.e.*, the anticipation band comprises content anticipation to be displayed after a scroll). Accordingly, Ashe fails to disclose or render obvious the limitations of claim 9 for at least the same reasons argued above with respect to claim 1.

Further, Parthasarathy fails to supply that which Ashe lacks. Specifically, Parthasarathy makes no mention of an anticipation band that comprises content anticipated to be shown in the visible part of the document after the document is scrolled. In fact, Parthasarathy merely discloses the use of a digital television decoder.

With respect to dependent claim 10, which includes subject matter similar to that recited in claim 2, argued separately above, Parthasarathy also fails to disclose or render obvious that the anticipation band comprises a minimum of one column of pixmaps on the right and on the left of the visible part of the document, and a row of pixmaps at the bottom and at the top of the visible part of the document, except in the case where the visible part approaches an edge of the document.


Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and favorable consideration of claims 2 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number [11345/120001]).

Dated: December 1, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant